

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

State of Arizona, ex rel. Kristin K.  
Mayes, Attorney General; et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Michael D. Lansky, L.L.C., dba Avid  
Telecom; et al.,

Defendants.

No. CIV 23-233-TUC-CKJ

**ORDER**

On December 10, 2024, this Court issued a Case Management Scheduling Order (Doc. 102), which stated, *inter alia*:

[E.]4. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.2(j), parties must personally consult and make a sincere effort to resolve a discovery dispute before seeking the Court's assistance. If the parties are unable to resolve a discovery dispute, the parties shall notify the Court by calling the law clerk . . . Written briefs shall be filed only at the direction of the Court.

Dec. 10, 2024, Order (Doc. 102, p.3); *see also* LRCiv 7.2(j).


Parties have advised the law clerk efforts to resolve discovery disputes, as well as to personally consult and make sincere efforts to resolve those discovery disputes, have failed. The Court finds it appropriate to set a briefing schedule regarding the parties' discovery disputes:

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiffs and Defendants may each file one brief presenting any discovery disputes on or before August 27, 2025. Plaintiffs and Defendants may each file responsive briefs on or before September 8, 2025, and reply briefs on or before September 15, 2025.

2. The briefs shall comply with the following page limitations, excluding exhibits, unless granted leave by the Court: Opening briefs and responses are limited to twelve (12) pages and replies are limited to seven (7) pages.

DATED this 11th day of August, 2025.

  
Cindy K. Jorgenson  
United States District Judge